Supreme Court U.S.
FILED
061389 SEP 12 2006
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Aisha Goodison,
Petitioner

v.

Madonna et al,
Respondent.

On Writ Of Certiorari
To the United States Court of Appeals
The Eleventh Circuit

BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

Aisha Goodison, pro se
P.O. Box 190073
Miami Beach, Florida 33119-0073
305-751-0036
www.aishamusic.com
law@aishamusic.com

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. What Judicial and Constitutional powers has a judge, Marcia Cooke, to summarily throw out a voluminous case (60 page complaint and 200 plus pages of evidence and CD-ROMs) on the SAME DAY of signing for and receiving it, December 21, 2005, which means she could not have read very much, if any of it and manage her other cases like Jose Padilla. A federal lawsuit, whose main claim is for copyright infringement, multiple, willful violations of Title 17 of the U.S. Code, filed in the right venue, under the correction jurisdiction, where indisputable evidence was submitted that unquestionably shows the Respondents willfully and criminally stole millions of dollars of released and unreleased copyrighted works belonging to the Petitioner, years after they were authored and registered with the Library of Congress and via other means to establish their unique dates of authorship. A pattern is emerging in copyright cases of judges denying litigants the right to trial in case against corporations with substantial evidence illustrating copyright infringement, opting to throw them out on opinion rather than the evidence, which is the subject of a forthcoming documentary film and soundtrack by the Petitioner. What Constitutional and judicial powers does a judge have to do so? Are the public not entitled to a fair, impartial, well read and thought out review of their cases, rather than a cursory look, if any at all and rush to judgment based on personal opinion of fame and not the facts and evidence.

2. Is the Petitioner entitled to relief under U.S. Copyright law and in the court system for the willful violation of her copyrights, where she showed the verbatim copying of her works without permission and proved access? The Petitioner is the sole owner of a valuable Copyright Catalog containing over 9,000 songs, over 100 scripts and short stories, 12 book manuscripts, 100 music video treatments and dozens of photograph treatments, that the Respondents in willful, criminal violation of domestic and international law, began to criminally use in blatant, open violation of U.S. and United Nations laws.

The Respondents willfully violated Title 17 of the U.S. Code, among other laws. In spite of the court submitted evidence showing wholesale, verbatim duplications of the Petitioner's already registered Copyrights without permission or payment - the 60 page lawsuit, 200 plus pages of indisputable comparative evidence exhibits and several CD ROMs containing comparative data numbering into the high megabytes, were quickly thrown out on the same day of receipt by Judge Marcia Cooke of the Southern District of Florida, citing a legally deficient premise that amounts to her opinion of a "pop culture icon" who went to her alma mater and not the observance of U.S. Copyright law, (Copyright Act 17 U.S.C. 101), the Lanham Act (The Lanham Act 15 U.S.C. 1051), The Universal Copyright Act of 1952, The Digital Millennium Copyright Act, The Berne Treaty of 1967, among others - all of which the Respondents willfully violated, as they have on many

formally recorded occasions prior regarding other U.S. and international citizens, for ill-gotten financial gain. This is chronic behavior on the part of the Respondents that has resulted in many lawsuits against them for said misconduct around the world – none of which they have won. Judge Cooke had no reason to reasonably believe the Petitioner's case was not worthy of merit – the evidence was there show it is. She showed blatant partiality in throwing out the case the same day she received it and by all appearances, did not even read the case, as it is not the human norm to ingest 60 pages of a complaint, 200 plus pages of evidence exhibits and hundreds of MB of data in less than one work day and tend to the rest of a judge's caseload during the middle of the week. This was a great miscarriage of justice. As a taxpaying law-abiding citizen, the Petitioner deserved more than that.

3. Can a Federal Judge act as a defacto character witness for a group of litigants (the Respondents) while insulting another based on her opinion and not the evidence? Within the first and only work day of having a complaint, in stating in a written ruling that a group of Defendants-Respondents could not have committed the "sensational" accusations leveled against them, when the evidence clearly shows they did, in a case where a lawbreaking Defendant-Respondent commissioned the theft of a treasure trove of copyrighted works and illegally spread them among her companies and associates in the entertainment industry. Judge Marcia Cooke, not citing any portion of Copyright Law or the Lanham Act, opting

to go with her opinion and gut feeling, proclaimed on paper that there is no way the Respondent, the frequently sued copyright infringer Madonna, having gone to her alma mater, who she fawningly referred to as a "pop culture icon" and the "companies who bring (her) entertainment to the masses" could have possibly committed the "sensational" "allegations" leveled against her, when the Petitioner submitted indisputable evidence of copyright ownership, copyright infringement and illegal access to her copyrighted works. The Petitioner also presented the Respondent's long, disgraceful history of copyright infringement in willfully violating the copyrights and further the privacy of dozens of U.S. and international citizens, which resulted in numerous lawsuits and verdicts against her.

Judge Cooke opted to refer to the case where millions of dollars of the Petitioner's copyrights were willfully violated, her computers hacked, her email accounts hacked, her web site hacked, her telephone wiretapped, her mail illegally intercepted, she was harassed, assaulted, defamed and libeled, all violations of United Nations human rights laws, as "amusing."

LIST OF PARTIES

Pro Se Petitioner: Aisha Goodison, a private citizen, is a singer, songwriter, screenplay writer, author, director, documentary

filmmaker and owner of sole proprietorship Sonustar; therefore rule 29.6 does not apply.

Respondents: Madonna A/K/A Madonna Ritchie, Bertram Fields, Guy Oseary, Guy Ritchie, Mad Guy Entertainment, Ska Films, Luc Besson, Europacorp, Steve Christian, Virinie Silla, Pierre Spengler, Christopher Ciccone, Mark Morgan, Maverick Records, Maverick Films, Webo Girl Music Publishing, Warner Bros Records, Warner Vision, Warner Chappell Music Publishing, WB Music Corp, Time Warner AOL, Motorola, Disney, Buena Vista Pictures, Walt Disney Pictures, Walt Disney Records, Michael Eisner, Jerry Bruckheimer, Jerry Bruckheimer films, Charles Howard, Sunil Nayar, Steven Maeda, Michael Ostrowski, Corey Miller, Ildy Modrovich, Brian Davidson, Marc Dube, Gary Marshall A/K/A Garry Marshall, Gina Wendkos, Meg Cabot, Shonda Rhimes, The Sun Newspaper (UK), News Group Newspapers LTD, Victoria Newton, Charles Dudman, Nicki Waterman, Stuart Prince, Steven Klein, Liz Rosenberg, Callaway Arts and Entertainment, Versace, Mario Testino, Britney Spears, Missy Elliot, Mirwais Ahmadzai, Jive Records, Sony BMG, Interscope Records, Patriot Pictures, Arclight Films, Michael Mendelsohn, Martha Coolidge, John Quaintance, Susan Jensen, Jessica O'Toole, Amy Rardin, Jonas Akerlund, Music Today Inc, Andrews McMeel Publishing, David Bercuson, Gwenyth Stefani, Harajuku Lover Music, Pharrell Williams, Chad Hugo, Star Trak, Nick Cannon, Darren Sherrill, Jones James Edward, Lilly Darron

Keith, Boogology Music, Lil D Music Publishing, Darren Sherrill Music, Lions Gates Films, Mark Amin, Katherine Fugate, Jack Amiel, Michael Begler, Jonas Akerlund, Universal Pictures, Paul Weitz, Chris Weitz, Depth Of Field, Joe Henry, Johan Renck, Prod4ever, Chime Interactive, Christian Karlsson, Pontus Winnberg A/K/A Bloodshy and Avant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED.....Page 2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....Page X
OPINIONS PRESENTED.....Page 1
JURISDICTION.....Page 1
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED...Page 1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....Page 2
REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....Page 17
CONCLUSION...Page 19
APPENDIX.....Page 20

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Federal Court: the lawsuit was filed on September 30, 2005, in the South District of Florida. After the first judge, Cecila Altonaga, was involuntarily recused for verbally abusing the Plaintiff-Petitioner in a December 9, 2005 hearing with no provocation, willfully not disclosing a significant conflict of interest in the case in that her husband, George Mencino, is a partner in the law firm Holland and Knight, which derives hundreds of thousands of dollars on a regular basis in legal fees from the Defendants-Respondents and that one of her children has

stock in the Defendants-Respondents' companies, the case was assigned to Marcia Cooke.

APPENDIX B – Judge Cooke closed the case on the same day she received it, December 21, 2006, opting to ignore serious violations of Titles 15 and 17 of the U.S. Code and the Fourth Amendment which guarantees citizens a right to privacy and further mocking the Petitioner in her ruling calling it "amusing" – a case with serious violations of domestic and international laws. Many laws were indisputably violated in this case, with digital data evidence unquestionably proving what transpired.

APPENDIX C – The appeal was docketed with the 11th Circuit Court Of Appeals on January 4, 2006, case # 06-11760-EE, then "dismissed" on May 16, 2006 due to misleading, erroneous information the Petitioner was given over the phone by a court clerk handling the case – information she thought would be reliable regarding what was being asked of her for said brief. She was told to submit another brief, but the deadline given to make it timely was a matter of days and landed on a holiday, eliminating the 4-day weekend for shipping purposes. She rushed in the second brief and the appeal was "denied" on July 6, 2006. No reason was cited for the denial and it has not been listed with the court as published or unpublished.

Laws And Statutes

Copyright Act 17 U.S.C. 101

The Lanham Act 15 U.S.C. 1051)

The Universal Copyright Act of 1952

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act

The Berne Treaties of 1967, which the U.S. joined in 1989 and swore to uphold

The Business and Professions Code of Sections 17500 to 17535

Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act

Title 18 Section 1341 of the U.S. Code (Mail Fraud)

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934

The U.S. Constitution: The Fourth Amendment

RICO Statues

The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec.1001

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec.1030

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 2510

The No Electronic Theft Act (NET)

17 U.S.C. 506 (a)(2)

18 U.S.C. 2319(c)(3)

The Universal Declaration Of Human Rights 1948)

The United Nations Guidelines on Computerized Personal Data Files

The European Convention on Human Rights

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

The Inter-American declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (Art V)

The Inter-American Convention on Human Rights (Art 11) and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Petitioner's minor sister's privacy was violated as well in invading the Petitioner's privacy)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Buchwald v. Paramount – 1990 California Superior Court filing where Eddie Murphy and Paramount Pictures were sued for breach of contract and copyright infringement over the film "Coming To America" that unlawfully used his story treatment as its basis, in the Hollywood tradition without credit or compensation to him. Buchwald won the case **(See Page 12).**

USA v. Pellicano (CR no. 05-1046 (C) – RMT) 2006 filing, Appellee Madonna's lawyer's private investigator indicted on 110 counts of wiretapping, fraud, hacking, racketeering and illegal access to personal records. Pattern of misconduct the Plaintiff-Appellant alleged in her lawsuit 5 months prior to the Pellicano indictments are the same set of charges and alleged misconduct the Plaintiff-Appellant alleged in her suit months prior to the District attorney's filing, revealing previously unreleased to the public pattern of misconduct utilized against unwitting entertainment industry members. **(See Page 12).**

Articles

1. "AOL Chief Technology Officer…" – The New York Times, August 11, 2006

2. "Royal 'Phone Tapping' Duo Charged" – CNN, August 9, 2006

3. "Company Says Hilton's a Hacker...Lohan a Victim" – TMZ, August 23, 2006

OPINIONS PRESENTED

The decision rendered by the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals has not been published, nor is it listed as unpublished.

JURISDICTION

On December 21, 2005, on the same day of receipt, Judge Marcia Cooke of the Southern District of Florida, closed the case based on her opinion, rather than Copyright Infringement (multiple violations of Title 17 of the U.S. Code) and multiple violations of the Lanham Act (Title 15 of the U.S. Code) in a set of rulings fraught with errors. The Southern District of Florida has jurisdiction over the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1331 and 28 U.S.C. 1338 as an action under 17 U.S.C. 101 et seq. The venue was correct pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1391 (b) and (c).

On July 6, 2006 the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals issued an order rendering the appeal "denied," after being docketed on January 4, 2006.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Copyright Act 17 U.S.C. 101

The Lanham Act 15 U.S.C. 1051)

The Universal Copyright Act of 1952

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act

The Berne Treaties of 1967, U.S. joined in 1989 Business & Professions Code, sec: 17500 to 17535

Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act

Title 18 Section 1341 of the U.S. Code (Mail Fraud)

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934

The U.S. Constitution: The Fourth Amendment

RICO Statues

The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec.1001

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec.1030

Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 2510

The No Electronic Theft Act (NET)

17 U.S.C. 506 (a)(2)

18 U.S.C. 2319(c)(3)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

From the start this case has been fraught with serious errors of every conceivable kind that were not of the Petitioner's making. From the clerical misspelling of main Defendant-Respondent Madonna's name via a clerk entering it into the local court system's computers and consequently the national court system, Pacer, as "Madoona" rather than "Madonna," which is not how the Petitioner typed it in the lawsuit, which would hamper the public and legal community from finding the case for citation, but thankfully it was placed online at www.aishamusic.com/lawsuit_main.htm by the Petitioner,

receiving millions of reads, to the judge tossing it out the same day she supposedly read it, citing law that does not remotely apply to the.

This progressed to misinformation being given to the Plaintiff-Respondent from both the Miami Federal Court and the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals, in the presence of a witness, which caused considerable problems in the case, even causing its dismissal at the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals, due to a profound error consisting of gross misinformation a clerk spouted off to the Petitioner as what was required of her. Litigants would like to believe that what they are being told by the Court is correct and when they follow it and their appeals are destroyed for doing so, it does nothing for public confidence, leaving members of the public feeling deceived and tricked by the Court system, in an attempt to get rid of a case.

There was also misleading and erroneous web site information on the Federal Court's web site as to the layout of a U.S. Federal Court lawsuit (style, numbering, format), as the downloadable Court form available online on the official Court web site for Miami is not in the correct format, style or numbering to be in compliance with the FRCP.

There were also erroneous judicial rulings sent out by Judge Marcia Cooke with missing pages, misspelled names, misspelled laws, misapplied U.S. law and the chastising of the Petitioner for

allegedly not following the previous judge's instructions, when she had followed the previous judge's instructions to a tee (regarding the number of pages in the amended complaint and legal representation for sole proprietorships, not corporations), therefore the error was with Judge Marcia Cooke in that she did not read the previous rulings properly or the case (lawsuit and exhibits). Had she, Judge Cooke would have caught all the errors in her rulings she sent out in the space of one day, that other professionals of the highest international level have later found legally deficient, erroneous and in contradiction to U.S. law and international law. She opted to close the case the same day she received it according to the docket sheet, clearly without reading beyond the first page, because had she, she would have seen the crimes being committed and the international implications of said crimes that are being discussed worldwide by legal officials, members of government and the world community, who have been following the case through the internet and the media.

Justice cannot function under such circumstances. The truth cannot be found in such haste, misinformation, disorganization and plain error. The taxpaying public deserves more than that. Over the last several months since the hasty closure of the case with voluminous evidence, substantial developments have occurred since the time of said legal filing, which have further shown the Petitioner is telling the truth about the misconduct that transpired.

Further Hacking

When Judge Marcia Cooke summarily tossed out the case in the space of one day of having it, it was clearly interpreted as a green light by the Respondents-Defendants to break the law to an even greater degree at the Petitioner's expense. Their behavior grew worse. They commissioned more break-ins to the Petitioner's home, at more frequent intervals, to steal newer copyrighted works she had authored that were not placed on her computer that connects to the internet, making it difficult to hack.

Copyrighted computer CD ROMs with volumes of intellectual property, containing thousands of songs, over one hundred scripts and short stories and over a dozen book manuscripts, were stolen right off the Petitioner's desk in her home office/recording studio. The Petitioner reported these break-ins to the Police, for which she has reports, and a week after the last break in on April 2, 2006, two of the unreleased projects on the stolen Copyrighted CD ROM work discs, for which the Petitioner has back up copies, amazingly appeared in the public domain shortly after attributed to the Defendants-Respondents in the case, namely Madonna. Respondent Madonna is a member of a cult, Kabbalah, who were sued for this very misconduct before via committing breaking an entry into a dead rabbi's home to steal the decease's Copyrighted book, then publishing it as their own. The cult were sued, lost, admitted liability and paid a $600,000 settlement. One of Aisha's books that was on one of the stolen CD ROMs surfaced a week and

a half after they were stolen and she filed the police report. The Petitioner's unreleased book "50 Reasons Why Hollywood Stinks" was published in the New York Daily News as a condensed article that was changed up somewhat to insert Madonna. The Petitioner's book was now sickly turned into an article attributed to Madonna. The "50 Reasons" were cut down to "5" points in a long New York Daily News article all about Madonna, constituting criminal copyright infringement and breaking an entry. The Petitioner then reported it to the FBI.

Hacking Continues

In light of the hackings continuing to 1 of 6 of the Petitioner's business computers, the one being hacked being the only one connected to the internet to write and publish her Sound Off Column, maintain her web site, record new songs in audio format, draft legal documents for this case, read the news online and pay bills, the Petitioner called out two reputable computer companies on different dates to independently test her computers systems and render on paper their professional diagnosis. Both reported the main computer that is still connecting to the internet is still receiving severe hacks, as did the one that was taken offline after being thoroughly hacked and damaged by the Respondents at an earlier date to make illegal copies of the Petitioner's unreleased Copyrighted Catalog, which they greedily and immorally plundered and pillaged for ill-gotten criminal gain, in conduct that still continues today via illegal usage of said copyrights.

The two unrelated companies, Computer Service America and Rescue Com, both specializing in computer data analysis and intrusion detection, concluded the same thing, the Petitioner's computers were severely hacked. This is one point of access to the unreleased copyrights, in addition to her web site, from which they stole the copyrighted works that have been released to the public.

They each wrote on separate occasions, neither being told of the other's diagnosis of the Petitioner's system or the legal case, that the Petitioner's computers have unquestionably been "hacked" – one rating the hacks as "severe" and the other as "critical." Ironically, on the day one of the companies was called out to look at the system via a previously arranged field visit, the computer was hacked and the computer company specialist got to witness the tail end of the hack, as the Respondents' commissioned hacker damaged the computer's software to illegally get in the computer, then erased his trail – but not well enough, therefore it was detected. The hacked files have been extracted along with snapshots, with multiple copies stored for future use.

NY Daily News Trojan

A few weeks ago, one of the computer specialists installed a reliable software program on the Petitioner's computer to search for Trojans that were giving the Respondents' continued full-scale access to her computer when it went online, transmitting the

contents to themselves and using it. Said program found two Trojans, both from the New York Daily News, the very company that months ago in April 2006, as previously mentioned in this Brief, illegally printed a condensed copy of the Petitioner's unreleased book "50 Reasons Hollywood Stinks" that was obtained via breaking an entry and stealing a copy of it that was on CD ROM on the Petitioner's desk, then a week and a half after the Police report was filed on the burglary, attributing it to Madonna in the New York Daily News.

They are also the very same newspaper that defamed and libeled the Petitioner in October of 2005 in the New York Daily News, the subject of a forthcoming lawsuit but the Petitioner, in an attempt to discredit her and the case, via a planted article by Madonna and her publicist Liz Rosenberg. New York Daily News journalist Lloyd Grove emailed the Petitioner to ask about the story, after the paper had already gone to print that evening, to be published the next day. This unquestionably shows how the Respondents' originally obtained copies of the Petitioner's private Copyrighted Catalog and began using it.

The FBI further sent the Petitioner a formal letter stating they have found that her personal data, identifying information and credit card have been illegally accessed and compromised via computer and it is apart of an ongoing investigation.

The Petitioner also traced one of the hacks/computer intrusions back to London, where Madonna and the Kabbalah cult reside. The Plaintiff-Petitioner also traced a death threat sent to her site www.aishamusic.com threatening to come to Miami and harm her (which they later did) back to London as well, all in the same vicinity.

She was assaulted (choked) on the same street as the courthouse in downtown Miami, while a man spewed back at her the contents of her private phone calls, albeit wiretapped as many people witnessed, and information about a missing letter. Lo and behold the Petitioner then went into Court minutes after for a pre-scheduled hearing in a civil matter, only to find out from a judge and his clerk that a critical letter was sent out to her via mail about her home, that never arrived to her in the mail. She then remembered what the man who choked her earlier in the morning spouted off about a missing letter.

It is important to note, the Respondent Madonna has been sued for choking a 10 year old child in New York, Keith Serrantino, a case which she quietly settled out of court and was also separately formally accused in a book about the Oscar's of choking entertainment industry veteran Dick Clark's son Rac. Respondent Madonna has displayed a penchant for choking that is very unhealthy and bares the signs of mental illness. Her conduct in public life, this case and numerous other lawsuits that have been

filed against her, none of which she has won, scores very high on Robert Hare's Psychopathy Checklist.

Newspaper Editor Arrested For Wiretapping The Royal Family

One of the Respondents the Petitioner accused in her lawsuit of wiretapping and illegally printing items from her already copyrighted works in the SUN NEWSPAPER, attributing it to Madonna, along with verbatim items from several of the Petitioner's domestic and international business and personal calls, is Respondent "NEWS GROUP NEWSPAPERS LTD" and their paper THE SUN NEWSPAPER LTD UK. NEWS GROUP NEWSPAPERS LTD owns the NEWS OF THE WORLD newspaper **whose editor was arrested three weeks ago for wiretapping the British Royal Family**, with a widening investigation looking into other people that they illegally wiretapped.

THE SUN NEWSPAPER LTD UK and NEWS OF THE WORLD are commonly referred to as "brother and sister newspapers" owned by the same company and both papers are run from the SAME OFFICE/BUILDING IN LONDON which is 1 Virginia Street, London E98 1NW. They share an office, employees, management, reporters, scoops and online archives.

The Petitioner Aisha filed a complaint with The Metropolitan Police in London in early October 2005, complaining about this same company on the issue of wiretapping and copyright infringement. The Petitioner kept a copy of the complaint she filed. She provided the Metropolitan Police investigator with a link to the lawsuit on her web site for him to read it. The Petitioner's web site software confirms it was accessed and read by the Metropolitan Police UK back in October of 2005.

Ironically, a month later, in November of 2005 the Metropolitan Police started investigating these same people for wiretapping the royal family and are widening the probe to see the full extent of who was wiretapped, according to Associated Press news reports out of London. The news of the investigation was just made public last month.

Ironically, much like how the Petitioner found out her privacy was being by the same company, they realized there was wiretapping when private, detailed items said over the phone by Prince William, his secretary and others, were being printed in the newspaper, which is quite sick.

This is an Anthony Pellicano tactic. Anthony Pellicano is Madonna's lawyer's frequently employed, but now incarcerated private investigator (***USA v. Pellicano)***, who was arrested for wiretapping many people in tinsel town and using said tactic in Hollywood against innocent people in the entertainment industry

on behalf of Madonna's lawyer's famous clients. Madonna's lawyer is Bert Fields, who is the subject of an ongoing FBI probe on illegal wiretapping that prompted 9 members of his law firm to jump ship and netted over 12 arrests of rich and famous miscreants along with members of law enforcement who aided Pellicano in the misconduct. Ironically, Bert Fields is also the attorney who lawyer who defended the disgraceful "Coming To America" copyright infringement case **(Buchwald v. Murphy).**

While the Petitioner is not implying Anthony Pellicano wiretapped the Royal Family – she is saying that newspaper clearly was inspired to use this subtler tactic of printing items in the paper unattributed, from private, illegally intercepted calls and voice mails, from his handiwork that he did on behalf of Madonna's lawyer Bert Fields. The dots have connected.

"Royal 'Phone Tapping' Duo Charged"

The investigation was prompted by complaints from Prince Charles' Clarence House office.

LONDON, England (CNN) -- A British tabloid editor and another man have been charged with snooping on other people's voice mail in a probe of wiretapping allegations that centered on Prince Charles' official residence, police have announced.

Clive Goodman, the royalty editor for the **News of the World**, and Glen Mulcaire, a 35-year-old suburban London resident,

were released on bail after **police charged each with eight counts of illegally intercepting phone messages and one count of conspiracy, London's Metropolitan Police said in a written statement**.

Goodman and Mulcaire are scheduled to appear in court on those charges on August 16. Goodman, 48, and Mulcaire were arrested on Tuesday as part of a police probe that started with Clarence House, the official residence of Charles and his wife Camilla, Duchess of Cornwall. **The charges against them span from January to May**.

Scotland Yard announced Tuesday that it was looking into wiretapping allegations that could involve of a number of people, including "public figures beyond the Royal Household" -- a term that covers both members of the royal family and their staff.

The intercepts "may have potential security implications," police said." - CNN

In her September 30, 2005 lawsuit that Judge Cooke summarily dismissed within one day of having it, the Petitioner further accused Madonna's label's ISP, the Warner Bros' owned AOL, of allowing a commissioned hacker full-scale access to her computers, when AOL was her Internet Service Provider. Said hacker not only illegally copied her copyrights via the online gateway and map to her computer via their servers, AOL allowed a miscreant to commit

identity theft and charge over $2,000 to the Petitioner's Visa Debit Card as a form of harassment. This evidence was submitted to Judge Marcia Cooke but she ignored it.

It is important to note that Madonna's lawyer's private investigator, Anthony Pellicano, had a team of hackers on staff full time, who committed identity theft and credit card fraud on a regular basis, to harass members of the entertainment industry who spoke out against, wrote about or sued Madonna's lawyer's clients. They were also accused in the DOJ indictment against them and a subsequent lawsuit of hacking Los Angeles Times journalist Anita Busch's computers to destroy her hard drive and block her from writing unfavorably about one of Madonna's lawyers' clients.

The Petitioner began writing about Madonna in her column years ago and AOL would allow a commissioned hacker illegally access to her computer to destroy the files on her hard drive, while they further blocked her from getting online to update her site with new articles, for days at a time blocking the internet service she has already paid them for, to stop her writing anything else about Respondent Madonna and how she was stealing the Petitioner's copyrighted works.

The Petitioner's claims about AOL and its wanton carelessness in their customer's privacy was confirmed again recently. Last month AOL, owned by Warner Bros, trampled on the privacy of their

customers in making public over 600,000 customers' personal identify data and search queries:

> "AP -- AOL's chief technology officer left the company and two other workers were fired in the aftermath of a privacy breach that involved the intentional release of more than 650,000 subscribers' Internet search terms.
>
> Although AOL had substituted numeric IDs for the subscribers' user names, the search queries themselves contained Social Security numbers, medical conditions and other data that could be traced to an individual. In fact, The New York Times was able to trace user 4417749 to Thelma Arnold, 62, of Lilburn, Ga.
>
> The data release is among a series of breaches involving sensitive information in recent months." - NY Times

Socialite Paris Hilton of leaked pornographic video fame, in conjunction with Warner Bros and Madonna infringed the Petitioner's copyrights again this summer stealing a video treatment that was copyrighted years ago and a bass line as well for the same song, via illegally using more items from the Petitioner's already copyrighted catalog they gained criminal access to, as mentioned above.

Paris Hilton is a member of the Kabbalah cult, which is now being run by Madonna. This month, Spoofcard terminated Paris Hilton's account for hacking into rival actress Lindsay Lohan's account.

In the Petitioner's lawsuit last year she accused Madonna and the Kabbalah cult of invasion of privacy and hacking, among other things, and what happened to actress Lindsay Lohan fits in perfectly with their standard mode of operation:

> "Paris Hilton was recently terminated from her SpoofCard account for allegedly breaking into unauthorized voice mail boxes. SpoofCard calling cards offer the ability to change what someone sees on their caller ID display when they receive a phone call.
>
> In this case, Spoofcard told TMZ that it will cooperate with any law enforcement inquiry into possible violations of the Federal Stored Wire and Electronic Communications Act involving unauthorized access to voice mail boxes. " – TMZ

A Kabbalah cult memo secretly obtained by Radar magazine last year, revealed the cults' practice and belief that they must get copyrights by any means necessary. And they do, even if it means felony hacking and breaking an entry for physical theft of intellectual property, as has been show via legal cases and public statements.

Kabbalah Cult

The main Defendant-Respondent, Madonna, is the front woman for the sick Kabbalah cult, whose members have committed cold-blooded murder, run huge drug operations for which they are now under indictment, committed hacking, breaking and entry to steal copyrights, willfully abused tax law and tax exempt charity status in two countries, for which they are being investigated individually by the IRS in America and Inland Revenue in England. There is a general air of lawlessness in said cult, and the Petitioner has unquestionably been a victim of it.

A doctor went on record stating one of the members of the cult who complained that she was being harassed, brainwashed and her privacy invaded by said cult, snapped and went on to commit a vicious double homicide, killing her boyfriend and elderly grandmother, stabbing them each several dozen times, while spouting off many things Madonna too has said at concerts, such as, she is "the Messiah." A doctor recently concluded that a member of their cult, Davis, is mentally one of the "sickest people" he's "ever treated."

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Miami District Court Judge Marcia G. Cooke, had no judicial authority from Congress, under the U.S. Code, The Constitution or United Nations law to strip the Petitioner of millions of dollars in Copyrights she authored years before the Respondents copied them

from her publicly viewed web site and further criminally accessed the unreleased portions of said multi-million dollar valued in its current state Copyrighted Catalog, via hacking, then criminally infringed them. This ruling was absolutely erroneous and in complete contradiction to the U.S. Code, U.S. Constitution, U.N. law and the justice and liberty this country was built on.

This case has attracted widespread attention due to the nature of the malfeasance and the bizarre judicial ruling from Cooke that sprang from it. It has been viewed by millions of people all over the world, many of whom have openly questioned how such a thing could transpire and how it could be tossed out of court so quickly and in such a manner with the judge presiding over the case, mocking a family's suffering as "amusing."

The Petitioner proved the substantial similarities, unequivocal verbatim copying of copyrightable and copyrighted materials belonging to her that the Respondents illegally accessed and willfully infringed.

Under domestic and international law, you cannot willfully and criminally steal copyrighted music, film scripts, book manuscripts and other items and use them in whole and part without permission. It is thoroughly illegal and thoroughly reprehensible on not just a domestic scale, but an international one as well.

CONCLUSION

The judgment should be reversed with the case remanded to the Southern District of Florida, with a new judge that does not have a bias or conflict of interest in this case. A judge who will actually read the case and the exhibits and properly and fairly consider its merits, as the judicial Cannons governing Federal judicial conduct says they should – not summarily throw it out the same day it is received – and further insult in ruling via inappropriate wording for a judge, the litigant whose family has been made to endure severe United Nations human rights violations.

Dated: September 6, 2006
Resubmitted: April 10, 2007
Miami, Florida
Submitted by Aisha Goodison

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

MIAMI DIVISION Case No.: 05-CIV-22618-COOKE/BROWN

AISHA, el al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MADONNA, et al.,

Defendants.

FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL AND DISMISSAL OF ALL PENDING MOTIONS AS MOOT

THIS CAUSE came before the Court upon a sua sponte review of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint [D.E. 33J, filed December 13, 2005. While a pro se litigant's pleadings must be construed more liberally than those pleadings drafted by attorneys, this leniency does not require the Court to rewrite an otherwise deficient pleading in order to sustain an action. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520.21 (1972); GJR Investments, Inc. v. County of Escambia, Fla., 132 F.3d 1359,1369 (11th Cir. 1998). And the

Court shall not do so in this instance. Before this matter was transferred to the undersigned, the presiding judge, the Honorable Cecilia M. Altonaga, required the Plaintiffs to amend their Complaint to no more than fifty (50) double-spaced pages [D.E. 30J. The result is that the original morass of a Complaint consisting of over two hundred (200) unwieldy pages, has been reduced to a fifty (50) plus page, morass of a Complaint.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) specifically provides that a pleading inter alia, must contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.

The most recent incarnation of this Complaint reads like a supermarket tabloid recounting the alleged exploits of pop culture icons, and the companies that bring their entertainment to the masses. An amusing read on some level, but not one sentence contained therein demonstrates that the Plaintiffs have been injured and are entitled to some relief.

In addition to failing to present a claim for relief, the Plaintiffs' Complaint has taken the commonly referred to "shotgun" approach to pleading. This is a violation of the time honored one-claim-per-count rule. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(b); Cesnick v. Edgewood Baptist Church, 88 F.3d 902,905 (11th Cir. 1996); Anderson v. District Bd. of Trustees of Central Florida Community College, 77 F.3d 364 (11th Cir. 1996); LS.T., Inc. v. Crow, 49 F.3d 679, 684 (11th Cir. 1995). Each "count" contains numerous allegations of

wrongdoing by the Defendants. These "allegations" are nothing more than sensational accusations that bear no relationship to each other, or the parties accused. To provide the Court with some legal bases for their claims, the Plaintiffs also refer to a series of statutes that have allegedly been violated. Some of these statutes are known to the Court and others remain to be conceived of, passed by the legislative branch of government, and sign into law by the President of the United States. The Court cannot fathom how the Defendants, or anyone for that matter, can begin to discern what wrongdoing the Defendants are accused of and more importantly, how to defend against these "allegations." Simply put, the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is legally deficient in all respects.

Based upon the foregoing, it is hereby, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Plaintiffs' Complaint is DISMISSED. The Clerk of the Court shall CLOSE this matter and DENY ANY PENDING MOTIONS AS MOOT.

DONE AND ORDERED in chambers in Miami, Florida, this 21st, day of December 2005.

"s/_____"

THE HONORABLE MARCIA G. COOKE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPENDIX B

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
RE: 06-11760-EE

AISHA KAMILAH MUSIC, ET AL,

Plaintiffs,

versus

MADONNA,
MADONNA CICCONE,
MADONNA RITCHIE,
GUY RITCHIE,
DISNEY, et al,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Southern District of Florida

ENTRY OF DISMISSAL

Pursuant to 11th Cir. R.42-3 (c), this appeal is hereby dismissed for want of prosecution because the appellant has failed to file a corrected brief and corrected record excerpts within the time fixed by the rules, effective this 16th day of May, 2006.

"s/_____"

THOMAS K. KAHN

APPENDIX C

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
RE: 06-11760-EE

AISHA KAMILAH MUSIC, ET AL,

Plaintiffs,

versus

MADONNA, MADONNA CICCONE,
MADONNA RITCHIE, GUY RITCHIE,
DISNEY, et al,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Southern District of Florida

Before: CARNES and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

By The Court:

Appellant's motion to reinstate this appeal is DENIED.